

UCSF

UC San Francisco Previously Published Works

Title

The right decisions need the right voices.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4857b4d3>

Journal

Lancet (London, England), 394(10204)

ISSN

0140-6736

Authors

McLemore, Monica R

Choo, Esther K

Publication Date

2019-09-01

DOI

10.1016/s0140-6736(19)32167-1

Peer reviewed

The right decisions need the right voices

Monica R. McLemore, PhD MPH RN and Esther K. Choo, MD MPH

Add address for ML please


Please return signature form and ICMJE form for both authors

Community-engaged care is an essential and powerful component of high-quality health care. Its premise is that the voices of those who are impacted, who experience a condition, or who have relevant lived experiences should be considered authoritative in all situations where decisions are made and human, time, or financial resources are being allocated. Likewise, the voices of scholars who represent the affected group are most likely to be aligned with its-community experiences, while providing the scientific rigor to assess its needs and develop and test effective solutions. When community voices are missing, accountability and transparency are impossible to achieve – which creates the potential for not only exclusion, but harm, harassment, and waste.

Take Black women's health. In sub-Saharan Africa, a woman's lifetime risk of dying in pregnancy or childbirth is 1 in 36 compared with 1 in nearly 5000 in high-income countries, while Black women in the US are more likely to die in childbirth than many women in developing nations. Even among Black women with a college education or higher, the pregnancy-related mortality ratio is 5.2 times that of their white counterparts. Progress to improve Black maternal mortality has been inhibited by damaging narratives, including that of the "high risk patient" (i.e., the individual comes with a set of inborn risk factors for poor health) and the concept that race is simply a proxy for socioeconomic status. These narratives, which conveniently ignore the toxic health effects of gendered racism, have flourished due to the persistent habit of systematically leaving those who should be *leading* the conversation *out* of the conversation. Some would say we should "include" these voices, a word that makes one think of a reluctant afterthought on a birthday party list: rather, we should *center* these voices.

Unfortunately, gendered and racial hierarchies define the guiding voices of healthcare. Every platform where an opinion is shared, from social media to traditional media to academic publications and venues, is resplendent with examples of how women – especially Black women – are ignored and dismissed. Even with topics most relevant to women, men all too often feel comfortable opining among themselves in a zone that is free of women (imagine how much more women are excluded when the conversations are not about women themselves).

Men typically collaborate with other men on scholarly projects that lead to papers and grants, and primarily cite each other in scholarly and scientific work, creating a cycle of “expert” framing in published work that can be inaccurate, yet perpetuated in grant proposals, scientific meetings, and clinical health services provision. These cycles contribute to the persistently low number of women as tenured professors, department chairs, and decision-makers within healthcare institutions. Exclusions are compounded when experienced by gender non-conforming, non-binary and other scholars whose lived experiences directly align with their research interests.

Is it right and good for everyone to speak up for the needs of a vulnerable population? Yes, of course. But in the process, we must pay special attention to the research, opinions, and recommendations of those from within the very group we claim to be advocating for, and when those voices are lacking, commit to addressing the factors that systematically keeps them out of the rooms where they are needed. The absence of these perspectives in health education, provision of health services, and biomedical research means we miss a prime opportunity to unlock promising new discoveries to improve health outcomes and mitigate harm across  populations.

A collective effort is required to bring these neglected voices to the surface. Journal editors have a responsibility here. Conference planners do too. So, too, do federal funders, clinical and research training sites, university departments and selection committees, promotion and tenure committees, hospital administrators, and licensure and regulatory bodies. Together, we can develop a shared roadmap to

ensure that the voices of communities are drawn out of the margins and into the epicenter of the effort to improve healthcare experiences.

| ~~Sometimes~~ ~~It~~ Those most impacted by inequities and discrimination are ready to lead the way to a better future. Ceding the floor to them should move us closer to understanding how to achieve health equity for the public we serve and those of us fortunate enough to be providers of care.

Additional Readings

Maternal Health: An Executive Summary for The Lancet's Series. Sept 2016.

Petersen EE, Davis NL, Goodman D, et al. Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Pregnancy-Related Deaths — United States, 2007–2016. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2019;68:762–765.

James, S. E., Herman, J. L., Rankin, S., Keisling, M., Mottet, L., & Anafi, M. (2016). The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey. Washington, DC: National Center for Transgender Equality.

Araújo EB, Araújo NAM, Moreira AA, Herrmann HJ, Andrade JS Jr (2017) Gender differences in scientific collaborations: Women are more egalitarian than men. PLoS ONE 12(5): e0176791

Rosenthal L, Lobel M. Gendered racism and the sexual and reproductive health of Black and Latina Women, Feb 2018.

Black Mamas Matter Alliance. <https://blackmamasmatter.org/resources/literature/?fbclid=IwAR0oM-ztNtIVUp2KPO5RYK8k9FoUE6SurYEW3aX5mzLaTfTNhd9gL6tjxfg>